

15109
To: Dr. E. Ashworth Underwood, whose encouragement
stimulated the writing of this paper, with grateful appreciation
from F. N. L. Poynter
John Chapman (1821-1894)
Publisher, Physician, and Medical Reformer
27. iii. 1950.

F. N. L. POYNTER



22200174162

John Chapman (1821-1894)

Publisher, Physician, and Medical Reformer

F. N. L. POYNTER*

IF ever Chapman's history is written fully and accurately," said Sir William Robertson Nicoll in 1913, "it would form a romance of the most extraordinary kind."¹ That history still remains to be written, and while many details of Chapman's life, for which we may well use the word "romance," have no place in medical history, there are many others which deserve our attention.

By the side of men like Vesalius and Harvey, Lister and Pasteur, he is, of course, a pigmy among giants; but these great pioneers, whose careers mark off epochs in the history of medicine, stand above the common level by their own right, and their stature has been demonstrated and measured by every medical historian. It is when we throw the light of research upon the ground from which they rise that we discover among the crowd of smaller figures some odd individuals who, by the errors, the false trends, the unsuccessful struggles which their careers exemplify, seem worthy of closer inspection, for the anatomy of failure can always be instructive. We find too those others who, while not achieving greatness in their chosen profession, have yet influenced its development at a critical period in its history and have besides brought to its problems a mind trained and experienced in some other sphere of activity.

John Chapman, publisher, physician, and medical reformer, would qualify for inclusion in either of these groups. He began to study medicine while a young man but his uncertain material circumstances prevented the completion of his studies and when at last, at the age of thirty-seven, he did obtain his degree, he had used the intervening period to such purpose that he was already a well-known publisher, the editor and proprietor of one of the leading English quarterly reviews, and the central figure of a group of men and women who were soon to be reckoned among the most celebrated of Victorian writers and leaders of thought.

He had cherished the ambition of making some great medical discovery which would make him famous. With such a background, and entering upon a medical career in full maturity, one would suppose that he

* Wellcome Historical Medical Museum, London, England.

¹ *A bookman's letters*, New York, 1913, p. 372.

brought to the new problems which confronted him the keen intelligence and capacity for independent thought which had made his *Westminster Review* the mouthpiece of the "philosophical radicals," and it would not have been altogether surprising if he had achieved his ambition.

Readily assimilating the new physiological teaching of Brown-Séquard and Claude Bernard, he introduced novel therapeutic methods by which he hoped to direct the attention of the physician from the mere symptoms of disease to its root causes. Unfortunately, his enthusiasm persuaded him to claim too much for his treatment. He stressed its value in the "cure" of cholera, so that it came to be identified with that disease, and when the intervention of no less a person than Robert Koch, by his discovery of the cholera vibrio in 1884, disproved his theories, his methods of treatment soon ceased to find supporters.

There was, however, one department of medicine in which he had great success. The relations between the doctor and the state, the internal organization of the professional associations, and the system of medical education are all topics which have a social as well as a purely professional importance. They were matters on which Chapman, by his interests and experience, seemed well qualified to speak. He expressed his ideas fully in the *Westminster Review*, the prestige of which was far greater than its circulation would indicate. His essays were noticed by leading members of the Cabinet and being welcomed as a thorough survey by "an impartial observer" they were of value to the government in the framing of the Medical Act of 1858.

Before considering the details of his medical career, it seems desirable, since he appears to have escaped the notice of the medical historian, to set down a brief outline of his earlier life and activities and to indicate the documents from which our knowledge of him is drawn. Chief among these are his own diaries, only two volumes of which are now known to exist, although there are indications that there were originally many more. These two small pocket diaries (for 1851 and 1860) were discovered on a bookstall in Sneinton Market, Nottingham, in 1913.² Together with a third volume, which contained consecutive entries for the first half of 1863 and scattered notes over a period of years up to December 1878, they were described by Mr. Sidney Race in three articles published in the *Nottingham Guardian* in 1915.³ At some later date, the owner of the two earlier volumes sold them to a Nottingham bookseller whence, by the agency of

² G. S. Haight, *George Eliot and John Chapman*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1940, p. ix.

³ May 4, 18; June 1.

Mr. Gabriel Wells, they found their way to the unique collection of George Eliot's letters and papers in the Yale University Library.⁴ In 1940, Mr. Gordon S. Haight, Professor of English at Yale, published these two diaries for the first time and added Race's description of the 1863 volume,⁵ which could not then be traced and which Race now states is "lost irretrievably."⁶ According to Haight, whose chief interest is in Chapman's literary connections, this volume was found in the possession of Mr. Clement Shorter who at one time planned to write a life of Chapman and who left a note stating that it "contained no literary references, but only records of Chapman's medical practice."⁷ An extract copied from a diary of 1888 and quoted by Haight⁸ was also found among Clement Shorter's papers, and suggests that other volumes of the diary may yet be found. Race informs us that Shorter told him "that he had purchased a diary from Mrs. Chapman's niece—most probably the one from which Haight's extract comes—and he said that he knew of others, which I gathered, though he did not say so, had been acquired by Sir William Robertson Nicoll."⁹ In addition to the diaries there are also at Yale many of the letters which passed between Chapman and George Eliot, as well as other papers and letters of Chapman's.

Among printed sources there are frequent references to Chapman in Herbert Spencer's *Autobiography*.¹⁰ Carlyle¹¹ and Browning¹² refer to him in their published letters. Cross, whose *Life of George Eliot* is the only substantial printed source quoted by J. G. Alger in his article in the *Dictionary of National Biography*,¹³ was more concerned to obscure the truth than to reveal it, and is consequently more than reticent about Chapman. Alger's account is incorrect in several particulars, and even Haight's detailed study is not without some errors and omissions which, in two valuable articles contributed to *Notes and Queries*,¹⁴ Race has corrected as well as adding further details of the 1863 diary.

II

John Chapman, the third son of William Chapman, was born on

⁴ Haight, p. ix.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 252.

⁶ Private communication, May 21, 1946.

⁷ Haight, p. 252.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

⁹ *Notes and Queries*, May 17, 1941, p. 348.

¹⁰ London, Williams and Norgate, 1904, 2 vols.

¹¹ *Letters to Mill, Sterling, and Browning*; ed. Alex Carlyle, London, 1923, pp. 288-9.

¹² *Letters*, ed. T. L. Hood, New Haven, 1933, p. 36.

¹³ *Supp. Vol. I*, 1901, p. 414.

¹⁴ April 26, May 17, 1941, pp. 293-5 and 347-9.

June 16, 1821¹⁵ in Warser Gate,¹⁶ Nottingham, where his father kept a druggist's and grocer's shop. In 1829 his family removed to the village of Ruddington, six miles outside the town, and here John Chapman spent the remainder of his boyhood until his father sent him to serve his apprenticeship to a watchmaker named Robert Mason, of Worksop.

He was an intelligent and handsome youth with so striking a resemblance to the portraits of Lord Byron that his comrades gave him the nickname of "Byron."¹⁷ In his spare time he eagerly attended the lectures given by visiting literary and scientific celebrities at the Pestalozzian Institution in Worksop. It was probably the mental stimulus he received from these intellectual contacts which convinced him that he was fitted for something better than a watchmaker's shop, for he ran away from his master and sought refuge with his eldest brother Thomas who was studying medicine in Edinburgh. Thomas appears to have condoned his younger brother's escapade, for he neither sent him back to his master nor to his father but took the extraordinary step of arranging for him a passage to Adelaide, South Australia, and providing him with the money and the stock necessary for establishing himself in business as a watchmaker and optician.¹⁸

We do not know how long he stayed in Australia, but it could not have been long. We next hear of him in London where, according to an old school friend, he was studying medicine at St. Bartholomew's Hospital;¹⁹ in 1842 he was in Paris, still pursuing his medical studies and counting Gay-Lussac among his teachers.²⁰ In 1843, he was employed as assistant to a surgeon at Derby and he described himself as a "surgeon" when, on June 27 of that year,²¹ he married Susanna Brewitt, the daughter of a lace manufacturer in Nottingham, a woman of good education and thirteen years his senior.

Once again, the shades of the Pestalozzian Institution seem to have prevented him from devoting his full energies to his profession, for the young "surgeon" had been at work on a little book called *Human Nature* based on James Martineau's radical theological views, and only a few months after his marriage he went in person to offer his manuscript to John Green, of Newgate Street, a well-known publisher of philosophical and theological works. Having already decided to dispose of his business, Green was not in a position to accept the offered work, but Chapman, who

¹⁵ Haight, p. 3 (where he states the day incorrectly—see p. 179); D.N.B. gives year as 1822.

¹⁶ *Notes and Queries*, April 26, 1941, p. 293. Haight says Ruddington.

¹⁷ *Athenaeum*, December 15, 1894, p. 828.

¹⁸ Haight, p. 4.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ Diary, January 4, 1851; Haight, p. 127; letter from Chapman to Johanna von Heyligensstaedt, October 24, 1861, Haight, p. 5.

²¹ Haight (p. 5) quotes from a certified copy of the entry at Somerset House.

was always an opportunist in such matters, became the owner of Green's publishing firm and in February, 1844, he published the book himself.

He had now set up house at Clapton, in East London, and here began the series of weekly evening parties which were to bring together the most outstanding figures in Victorian thought and literature. In the summer of 1847 he took the lease of a large house at 142, Strand, using the ground floor as business premises while his wife arranged the upper part as a kind of private hotel. Chapman had connections with American men of letters, many of whom stayed at his house in the Strand when they came to visit England. One of the first of these was Emerson, an English edition of whose poems had been published by Chapman in 1846. He stayed with the Chapmans for nearly three months and in a letter to his wife referred to Chapman as "a phoenix of a publisher a man of integrity and talent in his trade."²² Emerson was followed by many others, among whom were such eminent Americans as Horace Greeley, Noah Porter, W. C. Bryant and G. P. Putnam.

His house also served as a London centre for English writers. The most celebrated of those who stayed under his roof was George Eliot, who, when still using her own name of Mary Ann Evans, lived with the Chapmans for two years while she acted as sub-editor of the *Westminster Review*. Haight has dealt fully with this connection in his book *George Eliot and John Chapman*, and in his preface he asserts that "he was an important link in the chain of circumstances that transformed the country girl from Warwickshire into the most famous Englishwoman of her day."²³ How important a link he was it is difficult to overestimate. In 1846 he had published the first work from her pen, her anonymous translation of D. F. Strauss's *Das Leben Jesu*. It was while she was staying in his home that he introduced her to many of the famous people who visited him from time to time or were constant members of his weekly parties. Among these were Dickens, Thackeray, Carlyle, J. A. Froude, John Stuart Mill, Browning, Harriet Martineau, Mrs. Gaskell, Sir David Brewster, Herbert Spencer, Professor Richard Owen, W. E. Forster, George Combe, Francis Newman, Louis Blanc, W. R. Greg, Thornton Leigh Hunt—and G. H. Lewes.

In the four years from 1850 to 1854 she wrote many essays and articles at his request and suggestion, and in the latter year he published the only book which bears her real name on the title-page, *The Essence of Christianity by Ludwig Feuerbach. Translated from the second German edition*

²² *Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, ed. R. L. Rusk, 6 vols., New York, 1939, IV, p. 61.

²³ Haight, p. ix.

by Marian Evans. A few weeks after its publication she left England for the Continent with Lewes, and Chapman's circle lost at one blow two of its brightest members.

Herbert Spencer had met Chapman at a similarly critical period of his life. He was still a young railway engineer when he first went to one of Chapman's parties at Clapton in January, 1846.²⁴ Writing in his *Autobiography* of the year 1850, when he had become assistant editor of the *Economist*, his office being immediately opposite Chapman's house in the Strand, he says: ". . . my only opportunities of meeting strangers occurred at the house of Mr. Chapman (afterwards Dr. Chapman) to whose evening parties I had already been once or twice while he lived at Clapton. . . ." ²⁴ He, also, owed to Chapman the publication of his first book, *Social Statics*, and acknowledges the value of Chapman's encouragement—"The moral of these facts is that in the absence of a sympathetic printer, and a sympathetic publisher (for Chapman was anxious to bring out the book) . . . the book would not have been issued at all."²⁵ It was Chapman who introduced Spencer to Auguste Comte when, in 1856, he gave him a letter of introduction to the French philosopher and asked Spencer to take him his share of the profits in Harriet Martineau's abridged translation of the *Philosophie Positive* which Chapman had published in 1854.²⁶

At no time were Chapman's interests confined to the mere material production of books but extended also to the ideas which they contained. It was probably due to his lack of systematic scientific training that he did not pursue his own lines of thought to their conclusion, but he possessed that type of "fertilising" mind which throws off speculative ideas that kindle enthusiasm and stimulate creative thought in others. Often, when he perceived that something might come of this mental contact, he would not be content until the results were embodied in an essay for his review.

In his Diary, January 4, 1851, he writes: "The afternoon passed with . . . Herbert Spencer. In the course of conversation the latter was astonished to find me propounding a theory regarding population which he conceived to be peculiarly original with him; viz., that the power of reproduction is in an inverse ratio with the perfection of the individuals constituting the race, and several important applications of the doctrine, it seems, have been equally worked out by both of us. He told me the ideas had been familiar to him these two years,—I told him I worked them out for myself

²⁴ Spencer, *Autobiography*, I, pp. 294 and 347-8.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 356-7.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 492.

in Paris,—eight years ago; and that I was glad there was a chance they would now get utterance.”²⁷

Spencer, writing to his father on May 21 of the same year, says: “Chapman . . . is about to have the *Westminster Review*. It will come into his hands at the end of the year. Chapman has twice proposed me to write an article for the January number. The first time he proposed the population question on which he knows my views. But I declined on the ground that I wished to make it the subject of a book.”²⁸

By December 9, Chapman had persuaded him to change his mind, and he agreed to do the essay.²⁹ Meanwhile, he had been asked by Chapman to prepare a notice of a recently issued edition of W. B. Carpenter’s *Principles of Physiology*. “In the course of such perusal as was necessary to give an account of its contents, I came across von Baer’s formula expressing the course of development through which every plant and animal passes in the change from homogeneity to heterogeneity.”³⁰

This led to further thought on his “development hypothesis” and in the essay on “A Theory of Population” which Chapman published in the April 1852 number of the *Westminster Review* he wrote: “For as those prematurely carried off must, in the average of cases, be those in whom the power of self-preservation is the least, it unavoidably follows that those left behind to continue the race, are those in whom the power of self-preservation is the greatest—are the select of their generation.”³¹

If these had been the lines along which Chapman had been thinking as early as 1843, when he was a young man of twenty-two, it is not surprising that when, eight years later, he read Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, he should write of it in glowing terms. “It impresses me as one of the most important books of this century, and is likely to effect an immense mental revolution. The sagacity, knowledge and candour displayed in the work are unusually great and wonderful.”³²

This immediate and unreserved appreciation of a great theme argues an unusual insight and mental ability, from contact with which Spencer must have profited. Having admitted that “my only opportunities for meeting strangers occurred at the house of Mr. Chapman,”³³ Spencer acknowledges the debt he owed to Chapman and his circle when he writes, “I think I may say that the character of my later career was mainly deter-

²⁷ Diary, January 4, 1851; Haight, pp. 126-7.

²⁸ Spencer, *Autobiography*, I, 372.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 388.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 384.

³¹ *Westminster Review*, April 1852, pp. 499-500.

³² Diary, February 21, 1860; Haight, p. 237.

³³ Spencer, *Autobiography*, I, 347.

mined by the conceptions which were initiated, and the friendships which were formed, between the times at which my connexion with the *Economist* began and ended (i.e., 1848-53)."³⁴

Spencer's reference to Chapman's acquisition of the *Westminster Review* notes the beginning of a connection which was to last for forty-three years. Since 1824, when James Mill had established it with funds provided by Jeremy Bentham, the *Westminster Review* had changed hands several times. Under the editorship of James Mill (1824-28) and his son John Stuart Mill (1837-40) it had won a foremost place among English reviews. The proprietors and editors during the intervening periods were less talented, and when Chapman began to discuss its purchase in 1850 it was kept alive more by its past reputation than by its present achievements. In October 1851, Chapman became its proprietor at a cost of £300 and in January 1852 he issued the first of a brilliant new series, George Eliot acting as his assistant editor.

Chapman was generous to a fault with his contributors and for each number he paid out £250 in authors' fees alone, "an enormous sum for a quarterly that printed only 650 copies."³⁵ The inevitable result was that his affairs were always on the verge of bankruptcy. Haight does not think highly of Chapman's skill in business, and it must be admitted, not perhaps to his discredit, that Chapman was no "business man." Like Mr. Micawber, he was always hopeful of "something turning up," and he persisted in an uneconomic enterprise which became a perennial stimulus to English thought, especially in the fields of religion and the social sciences.

The affairs of his publishing house were in a similarly unpromising state. The works in which he specialised were books of great importance which no other publisher would have risked including in his catalogue, so obvious was it from their very titles that they could never become "best-sellers."

His characteristic of sacrificing profit to principle is seen most clearly in an incident which had repercussions throughout the world of letters. One department of the business which he had taken over from John Green was devoted to the sale of books, and it was his practice to allow a discount on all books purchased. This underselling was strictly forbidden by the powerful Booksellers' Association, of which he was not a member. Chapman was, on principle, opposed to every such infringement of individual rights and he openly challenged the Association. To the April 1852 number of the *Westminster Review* he contributed an article entitled "The Com-

³⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 424.

³⁵ Haight, p. 56.

merce of Literature" in which he exposed the evil results of this arbitrary price-fixing. Many authors who considered themselves penalised by the prevailing system openly supported him in his campaign. Chapman agitated to such purpose that the Association was forced to agree to submit its case to a committee headed by Lord Campbell, the Chief Justice, and to abide by its decision. Lord Campbell demanded that the case of the "Free Traders" should be heard and on May 4, 1852, at Chapman's invitation, there was a meeting at his house in the Strand of some of the most celebrated authors of the day, with Dickens in the Chair.³⁶ Among those who were not able to attend but who sent supporting letters to be read at the meeting were Carlyle and Gladstone. Chapman spoke eloquently for the free-traders. Describing the meeting in a letter, George Eliot says that he "read his statement very well and looked distinguished and refined even in that assemblage of intellectuals. . . . He has worked well and in a good spirit at this great question and has shown a degree of talent and power of mastering a subject which have won him general admiration."³⁷

He won his case. Longman and Murray took their defeat graciously and the Booksellers' Association agreed to dissolve. Soon, all the booksellers were offering books at discount, and Chapman, finding that he no longer enjoyed the advantages accorded him by his free-trading methods, saw his affairs going from bad to worse.

III

It was at this stage in his career that he decided to qualify for the practice of medicine. In view of his earlier experience as a "surgeon" it is not strange that the security offered by such a profession should have appealed to Chapman, and this he frankly admits. With his family responsibilities—he now had three children—his material concerns were becoming increasingly pressing, and there is no need to impute to him cynical motives for his decision.³⁸

One of his closest friends at this time was Barbara Leigh Smith, a cousin of Florence Nightingale and a granddaughter of the William Smith who defended Joseph Priestley after his flight to London. She was an ardent feminist and one of the founders of Girton College.³⁹ In 1857 she married Dr. Eugene Bodichon, a Breton physician who had worked for twenty years among the natives of North Africa.

³⁶ See "Report" 1852 in list of writings at end.

³⁷ Haight, p. 52.

³⁸ See Haight, p. 114.

³⁹ See Barbara Stephen, *Emily Davies and Girton College*, London, 1927, pp. 40-42.

Writing to her on September 15, 1855, he says: "And so you really think I should make a good Doctor! I have always felt that I should, and I wish I were one. It would be a great relief to me, when I am no longer in business, to have a medical degree to fall back upon."⁴⁰ Apparently he had already given serious thought to this plan, for he had worked out the number of lectures he would need to attend and the total cost involved if he were "to resolve on becoming a Doctor in 1857."⁴¹

It is a significant reflection on the state of medical education at this time that Chapman could contemplate preparing himself for a medical degree within the short space of nineteen months, and in the spare time allowed by many and exacting business interests. Yet this is what he actually achieved. He attended lectures at University College in Gower Street and at King's College in the Strand and he appears to have taken his studies seriously, for he complains of the rowdiness of the younger students which often spoiled the lectures of Dr. Budd and Sir William Ferguson at King's College.⁴² For his clinical studies he attended St. George's Hospital, where his friend Dr. Edwin Lankester was lecturer in materia medica, and with further assistance from the well-known "grinders" Messrs. Power and Mr. Hinde, to whose methods he gives warm praise,⁴³ he was able to present himself for examination at St. Andrews on May 6, 1857 and to obtain his M.D.

Whenever he touches on Chapman's medical career, Haight does him less than justice and seems to be lacking in historical perspective. However and wherever they gained their medical qualifications, the fact remains that Britain at that time could boast of as many competent physicians and successful surgeons as any other country. The evils of the day were notorious, and Chapman himself was foremost in bringing them before a wider public than could be reached by the purely professional journals. When Haight singles out St. Andrews as the "worst offender" in selling degrees, the figures which he quotes are all for years subsequent to the passing of the Medical Act and between three and five years after Chapman's graduation.⁴⁴ The figures given by Chapman show that in the ten years previous to the passing of the Act an average of fifty candidates (of which one-eighth were rejected) presented themselves each year, compared with an average of five hundred who took the examination at the Royal College of Surgeons.⁴⁵ "We are informed," says Chapman, "that of the last eighty rejected candidates 39 held the diploma of the same College (*i.e.*, of Sur-

⁴⁰ Haight, p. 93.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² Chapman, *Medical Institutions*, 1870, p. 90.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 93-6.

⁴⁴ Haight, p. 94.

⁴⁵ Chapman, *Medical Institutions*, 1870, p. 6.

geons)." He goes on to state that "Before the Medical Act was passed, the St. Andrews examination was already conducted both in writing and viva voce, it extended over several days, it was both scientific and practical, and its general excellence obtained for it the commendations of the medical journals of the time."⁴⁶

Haight is in error when he implies that Chapman's degree did not allow him to practise in London.⁴⁷ It did not carry the *legal* right to do so, but the Royal College of Physicians had long since ceased to use its powers of proscription. It was not essential therefore for Chapman to become a Licentiate before he commenced practice. Haight, acknowledging that the Royal College of Physicians was "the most exacting both in its examination and its fee," asserts that Chapman "chose the easiest course"⁴⁸ in going to St. Andrews, but makes no comment on the fact that within a few months of doing so he also became a Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians. Three years later, after two months' intensive study with Mr. Hinde, he became a Member of the Royal College of Surgeons.

His position as editor of an influential review which he retained until his death gave him unusual opportunities for publishing his views on all matters which engaged his interest and it was not long before his medical preoccupations were reflected in the pages of the *Westminster Review*. Projected reforms in the organization of the medical profession had been under discussion ever since the Parliamentary Commission had issued its report in 1834. Chapman belonged to a school of political thought which upheld "genuine Liberalism . . . and reprobated the excesses of Government-meddling."⁴⁹ In April 1856 he published in his review his own article on "Medical Despotism" in which he attacked the proposed medical reform bill on the grounds of "legislative interference" and "flagrant encroachment of the fundamental rights of English citizens."⁵⁰

In April 1858 he contributed a second essay on "Medical Reform" and in July of the same year another on "Medical Education." These were both full and well-documented accounts, not only of the unsatisfactory state of affairs then existing, but of the historical developments which had made demands for reform inevitable. On July 24, 1858, the editor of the *Medical Times and Gazette* wrote: "It becomes a duty for us to draw attention to two articles which have appeared in the *Westminster Review*, especially as it is well known that they have had a marked influence in inducing the Government to assist in passing the modified Bill of Mr. Cowper."

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

⁴⁷ Haight, p. 94.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁴⁹ Spencer, *Autobiography*, I, 421.

⁵⁰ *Westminster Review*, April 1856, p. 538.

Twelve years later Chapman added to these articles and republished them in the *Medical Mirror*⁵¹ and in 1870 they were published in book form with the title *The Medical Institutions of the United Kingdom: A History Exemplifying the Evils of Over-legislation*. Referring in the preface to the influence of the original articles on the framing of the Medical Act, he adds: "The writer cannot, however, take to himself much credit for this result. The fact was, successive Ministers had been so bewildered by the widely different representations made to them of what constituted the political grievances of the Profession, and what Medical Reform ought to achieve, that Mr. Walpole, then Secretary of State for the Home Department, regarding these articles published in a non-professional Review as impartial and reliable, was glad to avail himself of them as a source of information uncoloured by party interests."

Chapman's opening remarks are of particular interest to the medical historian. "No public opinion," he states, "and no satisfactory legislation on medical affairs is possible until Ministers, as well as Parliament and the people, become acquainted with the history of our medical institutions, and of their effects on the public and on each other. But no such history at once sufficiently brief and intelligible to command attention exists."⁵² It was his purpose in writing this work to supply such a history. After a brief introductory survey of the history of medicine from the time of the Alexandrian School onwards, for which he quotes as his authorities Freind and Renouard, he commences the main body of his work by dealing with the Acts of Henry VIII which were the first of a long series of legislative enactments investing exclusive rights and privileges in the medical corporations.

He describes the "selfish conflict" and "ceaseless injustice" which followed from the establishment of these "vested interests." "But only in proportion as they are artificially fostered by the State is their resistance injuriously prolonged, only then can they so completely deaden enterprise and stifle competition as to destroy the very life they were appointed to foster."⁵³ He produces abundant evidence, with recorded testimony, of the many occasions on which the Royal Colleges had proved themselves inimical to the true interests of the profession and to the progress of medical science. "But though men like Dr. Wells, Dr. Fothergill, Dr. William Hunter, Dr. Copland and Dr. Locock were not admissible into the College (of Physicians), Charles Duke of Richmond and John Duke of Montague, slight dabblers in medical science and never practitioners, were found eligible and were elected."⁵⁴ He cites the opposition of the same College to the de-

⁵¹ N.S. Nos. 7-13, 1869-70.

⁵² Chapman, *Medical Institutions*, 1870, p. 1.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 68-9.

mand of the Medico-Chirurgical Society for a Royal Charter, and the antagonism of both Physicians and Surgeons to the new London University, while he gives a lively account of the discreditable episode when, by their neglect, the Surgeons allowed Sir Everard Home to make away with John Hunter's manuscript volumes after they had been purchased from public funds and entrusted to the College for safe-keeping.⁵⁵

His strictures on the teaching methods in medical schools are given added point by his own experiences, which were still fresh in his mind, but he does not content himself with mere destructive criticism. Firmly believing that in a free society the most talented naturally assume leadership, he advocated the abolition of those exclusive rights, conferred by government, which set a premium on mediocrity. "In April 1856, we expressed at length our objections to the forcible constitution of any central council whatever as a government organ for exercising supreme jurisdiction over the profession of surgery and medicine, and recommended the simple expedient of severing the connexion of all medical bodies with the State."⁵⁶ The profession should be completely self-governing and democratic. Careful to protect the value of their own qualifications, members of the various corporations would insist on the maintenance of high standards, and the institutions would, as Chapman puts it, "compete *upwards* with one another in ensuring the best possible education to their members whose enlarging views and increasingly noble purposes they would continuously and faithfully represent."⁵⁷

Such, then, were the views which Chapman put forward in 1858. He admits himself that while his survey of the problem was of value to the government his suggestions for reform were not accepted. Writing in 1870, he says: "Our prophecies published at that date have been fulfilled; the power of the corporations has been consolidated; the 20,000 members of the Profession are still denied a voice in the framing of their own constitution, in administering their own government, or in disposing of their own funds; and now the half of these usually quiet and submissive subjects of the Medical Council, goaded into anger by the long endurance of this injustice and tyranny, are in a state of tumultuous agitation bordering on revolution. Amid the confusion of divided counsels, the complacent ignorance, the ambitious meddling, and the conflicting plans of would-be medico-political leaders now observable, the compact and combined forces of despotism and bureaucracy will probably again achieve an easy victory."⁵⁸

In these words one can perceive the spirit of the man who had, at the

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 103-7.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 109-10.

age of thirty-one, challenged and broken the powerful Booksellers' Association, but who now sadly acknowledges the growing power of the "combined forces of despotism and bureaucracy."

Chapman's contribution to medical history, which had emerged as a side issue from his zeal for reform, did not end with these essays. In 1858 he had contributed to the *Medical Times and Gazette* two short articles on "Chloroform and other anaesthetics: how they act, how they kill, and how they may be safely used"⁵⁹ which were reprinted as a small pamphlet later in the year. This was merely an ordinary piece of medical journalism, presenting a useful summary of known facts. In the following year he published a long essay in the *Westminster Review* on "Chloroform and other anaesthetics: their history and use during childbirth,"⁶⁰ and this too was reprinted in the same year as a small book of fifty-one closely printed pages. Well documented and clearly written, it is a compact survey of the history of anaesthetics from the earliest times, based on such authorities as Sir J. Y. Simpson (*Obstetric Memoirs*, 1855), John Snow (*Chloroform and Other Anaesthetics*, 1858), Esdaile (*Mesmerism*, 1852), Sir H. Davy (*Fragmen-tary Remains*, 1858), Bigelow (*Aether and Chloroform*, 1848), and Channing (*Etherization in Childbirth*, 1848). Written at a time when the discovery was still comparatively recent, his account gives evidence of a good historical sense and sound judgment, and he does not fail to assess the contributions of Priestley, Lavoisier, Beddoes, Davy, Hickman, Wells, Morton, Jackson, Bigelow, and Snow. In the great controversy over the use of chloroform in childbirth he declares himself a supporter of Simpson.

That Chapman had the time, within the first two years of his entering the medical profession, to write these papers in addition to carrying on his publishing business and editing the *Westminster Review* does not argue a very flourishing practice, and, in fact, as late as July 1860 he admits that he is still "waiting for practice."⁶¹ In his Diary, he notes a call on Dr. Brown-Séquard, "who said a serious objection to me might possibly be raised that I had been in business."⁶² He had long been trying to dispose of his publishing interests, which had become a burden, and in 1860 he succeeded in transferring them to a young man named George Manwaring; but within two years Chapman and Octavius Smith, his chief backer, were forced to take back the business when Manwaring declared himself unable to meet his obligations. A more satisfactory arrangement was arrived at when, in 1862, Trübner and Co. took over responsibility for all Chapman's (and

⁵⁹ October 23 and 30, 1858.

⁶⁰ *Westminster Review*, No. 72, Jan. 1859.

⁶¹ Diary, July 24, 1860. Haight, p. 245.

⁶² *Notes and Queries*, May 17, 1941, p. 347.

Manwaring's) publications while Octavius Smith agreed to join in a fund for the support of the *Westminster Review*, of which Chapman was to remain editor. Henceforth, Chapman was able to confine his attentions to the editing of the *Review* and to the practice of medicine.

Early in 1858, he had removed from Blandford Square, where he had been living for three years after leaving his house in the Strand, and settled at 1, Albion Street, Hyde Park. It was in this house that he was 'waiting for practice' when, in 1860, he was weighing up the advantages of taking a country practice or of remaining in London and endeavouring "to cultivate a practice among insane patients."⁶³ The treatment of mental disease seems to have held a special appeal for him and his views on psychological medicine are remarkably enlightened and forward-looking: "But the diseases of persons," he writes, "whose minds are highly cultivated and developed, are often complicated, modified, and dominated by subtle psychological influences, whose intensity and bearing on the physical malady it is difficult to apprehend and appreciate, and which it is still more difficult to contend with and control. In other words, the more civilised and refined people are, the more individual, peculiar, and manifold do their natures become; and in proportion as their ideas, interests and emotions are many-sided and complex, will be the ascendancy of the mind over the body, and the consequent need that their medical advisers should be psychologists and moral philosophers as well as physicians."⁶⁴ And again: "In proportion as the wonderful influence of the mind on the body shall be recognised and appreciated, the office of the physician will be exalted, and he will become more and more habituated to track the causes of a large amount of disease into the secret recesses of the soul itself. He will find that his remedies to be successful must too often be applied there."⁶⁵

By January 1863, when he removed to Somerset Street, Portman Square, he appears to have succeeded in his intention of specialising in this department, for he retained his former residence in Albion Street "as an office and for the accommodation of boarding patients, principally insane."⁶⁶ It is highly probable that it was from his practice with this type of patient that he derived such an exaggerated belief in the efficacy of his "spinal ice-bag," a method of treatment which he had suggested to Barbara Leigh Smith as early as 1856,⁶⁷ and it is doubtless this "discovery" which was in his mind when he wrote to his friend Lord Stanley "telling him

⁶³ Diary, July 24, 1860. Haight, p. 245.

⁶⁴ Chapman, *Medical Institutions*, 1870, p. 84.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

⁶⁶ Clement Shorter's transcript. Haight, p. 113.

⁶⁷ Haight, p. 114.

explicitly of the nature of my discovery to cure epilepsy. I gave him this information by way of establishing my claim to it, if it should hereafter be disputed.”⁶⁸ On this slender basis he now constructed a system of “Neuro-Dynamic Medicine,” the principles of which were founded on his belief that practically all diseases were of nervous origin and the practice of which consisted in applications to the spine, over long periods, of sources of local heat and cold. Reviewing what he considers his “success” in 1872,⁶⁹ he writes: “I am disposed to regard the progress already made in diffusing a knowledge of the principles and practice of Neuro-Dynamic Medicine as very encouraging and corroborative evidence of both the truth of the one and the efficacy of the other. It is scarcely ten years since the first crude expression of these was published;⁷⁰ in 1863 the first book on the subject was issued. That book was a monograph on the Functional Diseases of Women.”

In extending his methods of treatment to these diseases he had sufficient success to be gratified by the results, as was also the case when he recommended his “spinal ice-bag” for sea sickness (1864), but in 1865 he published a work in which he claimed to “cure” cholera “through the agency of the nervous system, by means of ice.”⁷¹ It would be easy for us, looking back from the mid-twentieth century, to adopt a patronising attitude and dismiss Chapman’s “neuro-dynamic medicine” as quackery, and, indeed, this is exactly the view taken by Haight, but the reception given to his theory by many eminent practitioners of his own day was somewhat different. Marion Sims recommended to his students Chapman’s *Functional Diseases of Women*.⁷² The first edition of his book on cholera was quickly sold out and within a few months a greatly enlarged second edition was in the press. Clifford Allbutt, reviewing this in the *Medical Press and Circular*,⁷³ stated that it “displays an amount of insight and originality, as well as logical cogency, which cannot fail to commend it to every philosophical mind,” while Sir Andrew Clarke, in a long review written for the *Medical Times and Gazette*⁷⁴ admitted, with cautious reservations, that “Even a false theory when rightly constructed has its uses and instead of hindering, hastens the advance of knowledge. . . . Dr. Chapman’s theory is in harmony with the most recent physiological investigation; it is ingenious, clearly put, happily illustrated, logically argued . . . and will take a permanent place in the history of the disease

⁶⁸ *Notes and Queries*, May 17, 1941, p. 347.

⁶⁹ Chapman, *Neuralgia*, 1873. Preface.

⁷⁰ See list of writings at end: 1863 (first item).

⁷¹ See list of writings at end: 1865.

⁷² J. Marion Sims, *Clinical notes on uterine surgery*, 1866, p. 41.

⁷³ October 4, 1866.

⁷⁴ November 3, 1866.

which it treats." W. B. Carpenter, the physiologist, considered his "researches as of the highest physiological interest and theraputic value,"⁷⁵ and Ernest Hart, physician at St. Mary's Hospital and editor of the *British Medical Journal*, expressed his belief that "the profession is indebted to him for a valuable contribution to the healing art."⁷⁶ In 1867, he read a paper on his treatment of epilepsy to a lively and well-attended meeting of the Medical Society of London, the meeting being twice prolonged beyond its usual time at the request of the members. Even the sceptics admitted that they had achieved some success in some cases with his treatment.⁷⁷

Chapman was now on the staff of the Metropolitan Free Hospital and the Farringdon Dispensary, of which the chief physician was his old friend and teacher Dr. Edwin Lankester, who offered to contribute an article on Chapman's discovery to the *Athenaeum*. In conveying the information to the editor, Chapman writes: "I am so far a believer in myself as to venture the assertion that the time will come when the medical doctrine and method I am preaching will be so generally known and practised that spine-bags will become articles of domestic furniture as indispensable as tea-kettles!"⁷⁸ For nearly thirty years "Dr. Chapman's spinal ice-bag" was figured in S. Maw, Son and Thompson's catalogue. It is a long and narrow india-rubber bag, some twenty-four inches by eight inches, divided into three or more compartments and secured by a clasp. By its side is "Dr. Chapman's india-rubber bag for hot water." Chapman had patented them both in 1867, and it is a descendant of the latter, with its screw top, which has won the universal popularity he desired for his ice-bag.

Even after Koch had published his discovery of the cholera vibrio in 1884, Chapman was reluctant to give up his theory and in an essay in the *Westminster Review*⁷⁹ he attempted to discount the findings of the great bacteriologist. If excuse be needed for his obstinacy, it must be remembered that he was already sixty-three and that he was not alone in his refusal to accept Koch's discovery. The famous Max von Pettenkofer set so little store by it that he swallowed a pure culture of Koch's bacillus and, by some strange chance, suffered few ill-effects from it. Chapman also found support for his stand in the report of the Marseilles Commission which was investigating the French cholera outbreak of 1884 and which arrived at the conclusion that the nervous theory of cholera was that which best explained its physiological pathology. During the Paris epidemic in that

⁷⁵ Chapman, *Cholera curable*, 1885, p. ix.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ Chapman, *The treatment of epilepsy*, 1889, passim.

⁷⁸ Chapman to Wm. Hepworth Dixon, March 10, 1868; Haight, p. 115.

⁷⁹ October 1884, 122, 472-533.

year he was invited by Professor Peter to treat twelve cases in the Hôpital de la Charité. Ten of Chapman's patients recovered, while of the other cases which were simultaneously treated within the same walls by other means only 52 per cent survived.⁸⁰

But whatever may have been the value of his treatment, his theories were doomed to oblivion with the rise of the new epidemiology, although he continued to press their claims until shortly before his death in 1894.

Before closing this brief study of John Chapman we must touch upon the events which led him to spend the last twenty years of his life practising his profession among the English colony in Paris. These are material for a romantic novel rather than a scientific paper, but our survey of his life would not be complete without some reference to them. Chapman's views on the marriage tie were anything but orthodox, especially in his own day, and in June 1863 he and his wife agreed to separate. Such a step must have been long anticipated for in 1862 he reported a conversation with his friend Andrew Johnson, Principal of the Bullion Office of the Bank of England and personal friend of Karl Marx and Freiligrath: "His opinion is strongly against my going into the country with a view to practise my profession. As he says, if I do that I must be prepared to live what is called 'respectably,' to conform to present ideas in respect to my social life, as he does, and to forego all expression of my real convictions: . . . Wherever I go I will strive above all things to be and seem myself. . . ."

"Only if I cannot live here in modest comfort should I be justified, as it seems to me, either on public grounds or by expediency, in leaving this country. Of course, I claim the right to order my own private and domestic life as shall seem to be best, and if as a condition of obtaining an adequate income English Society insists that I shall live in the same house with a person who is repulsive to me, then I shall feel it my duty to live in such place and in such manner as will best insure my individual freedom."⁸¹

Apparently, "English Society" did so insist for in 1874 he left London for Paris where in 1879 he married Hannah Macdonald, a widow twelve years his junior and a woman of considerable character and charm. He established his office at 224, Rue de Rivoli, above Galignani's, and his name figured prominently among the recommended physicians in the English editions of Baedeker. His home at 46, Avenue Kléber, where his second wife proved an admirable hostess, continued to be a centre for English, American, and French writers and radical politicians and journalists until his

⁸⁰ Chapman, *Cholera curable*, 1885, p. xii.

⁸¹ Chapman to Johanna von Heyligenstaedt, March 6, 1862. Haight, p. 113.

death. Late in 1893 he was involved in an accident with a cab and he suffered broken ribs and other injuries which were a direct contribution to his death on November 25, 1894. His body was brought to England and buried just behind George Eliot's grave in Highgate cemetery. A year later his widow procured a warrant for his reinterment in a more prominent position close to the path and only a few yards to the right of George Eliot. Mrs. Chapman was later buried in the same grave which is marked by a flat stone.⁸²

His first wife had died in 1892 at the age of 84; his son Ernest, who was an analytical chemist, had lost his life in a laboratory accident in the Harz Mountains in 1872 when he was only twenty-six years old. As recently as 1915, his widow was discovered living in Hammersmith Infirmary by Mrs. Cobden Sanderson, who installed her in apartments in Manor Place, Paddington, and for a few days her story, rich with the memories of Victorian celebrities, among which Chapman's name was prominent, could be read in the newspapers of the time. She, too, died in tragic circumstances, for only a few months later she accidentally set fire to her bedclothes and was burned to death.

There is no doubt that in Chapman's character there were traits which could be disastrous to any physician and which Haight has fully illuminated. We are indebted to Mr. Sidney Race, who had opportunities of speaking to many of Chapman's relations and friends, for a more pleasing picture which tends to show that "he was the victim of the admiration which his beauty created," and to demonstrate that this is no exaggeration he quotes an interesting description of him by the late T. P. O'Connor: "A curious, intensely interesting, slightly mysterious, wondrously attractive creature, Dr. Chapman was . . . a strikingly handsome man. I did not know him till he was an old man, but even then he was beautiful. He was upwards of six feet high, had massive and at the same time beautifully chiselled features, large, brown, soft, inscrutable eyes, a beautiful mouth,

⁸² The writer is grateful to Mr. Gordon Haight, who read the paper in proof, for pointing out an error based on Race (*Notes and Queries*, May 17, 1941, p. 348) who wrote: "Though he was buried near to George Eliot in Highgate cemetery, as Mr. Haight states, his widow had the body removed later to a grave on the opposite side of the path. Mrs. Chapman herself told me this, and it has been confirmed to me by her nephew who was present at the first interment. No stone marks the grave."

only from the third to the first rank of graves, on the same side of the path. The original site is now the grave of Charles Watts, founder of the Rationalist Press Association. The stone on the second grave is inscribed: "In / Memory / of / Doctor John Chapman / Born 1821 — Died 1894 / Editor & Proprietor of / The Westminster Review / Also of / Hannah Chapman / Born 1833 — Died 1916 / Second Wife of the Above / Who on the Death of Dr. Chapman / Continued the Publication / of / The Westminster Review / under her Own Editorship."

A personal visit to Highgate cemetery confirmed the fact that there *was* a reinterment, but

a beard, long, white, patriarchal, a carriage erect, dignified, impressive, and above all that indescribable quality called magnetism. Whether it was that he spoke but little, or that he carried himself so proudly, or that he suggested a certain impenetrable reserve, in spite of extraordinary courtliness of manner, whatever the reason there was always something about him that impressed you."

"His relatives have told me," says Race "[that he was], not fond of surgery, but in medicine he was a competent practitioner, despite his fondness for his ice-bag remedy. . . . Those who knew him best bear witness to his great kindness, to his truthfulness, and to his tenderness towards suffering."⁸³

This is valuable testimony to set against Haight's doubts of his sincerity and enables us to judge the true value of Chapman's own eloquent description of the ideal physician:⁸⁴

The soldier who battles with a foe whose Protean shapes are countless, and whose secret and mysterious influence baffles the scrutiny of the ablest intellects, surely needs, above all others, to be well-equipped, and to be trained to observe accurately, to reason logically, to decide cautiously, and to act promptly. He needs to be at once an able and an acute tactician, to be fortified by an extensive knowledge of physical science, and to command all the resources of his art without being trammelled by such of its traditions as are rendered venerable only by age, or by such of its usages as enlightened experience condemns. But, besides a disciplined intellect, stored with science and skilled in art, the "duly qualified physician" needs especially to be richly gifted with the moral sentiments. The man who walks in the midst of pain and suffering so destitute of feeling as to be untouched by the sight of affliction, or who has so little strength of character that he neither commands obedience nor inspires trust, has mistaken his vocation. In proportion as the wonderful influence of the mind on the body shall be recognised and appreciated, the office of the physician will be exalted, and he will become more and more habituated to track the causes of a large amount of disease into the secret recesses of the soul itself. He will find that his remedies to be successful must too often be applied there. He will feel called upon to succour the weak, to rebuke the self-indulgent, to sympathize with the trouble-stricken, to correct morbid views of life and duty, to cheer the despairing, and, where hope is no longer possible, to smooth the way through the dark valley with such comfort and consolation as only he who is both wise and good can administer. In short, our conception of a physician comprehends a general as well as a special culture of an already fairly gifted nature: and whatever changes in the present system of medical education will most surely result in providing the country with physicians of this order, we shall hail as the real "medical reform."

The man who could write such a passage and attempt to live up to it in his practice was more than a mere nonentity, both as a man and as a physician.

⁸³ For most of these details see *Notes and Queries*, April 26 and May 17, 1941.

⁸⁴ Chapman, *Medical Institutions*, 1870, p. 52.

A CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF JOHN CHAPMAN'S WRITINGS*

1844

Human nature: a philosophical exposition of the divine institution of reward and punishment which obtains in the physical, intellectual, and moral constitutions of man: with an introductory essay. To which is added a series of ethical observations written during the perusal of the Rev. James Martineau's recent work entitled "Endeavours after the Christian life."

1845

The philosophical and aesthetical letters of Schiller, etc. (with a preface by J. C.).

1847

Characteristics of men of genius: selected chiefly from the *North American Review*. 2 vols.

Brief outlines and review of a work entitled "The principles of nature, her divine revelations, and a voice to mankind. By and through Andrew Jackson Davis." . . . Being the substance of a preface to that work.

1851-4

(Ed.) Chapman's Library for the people. 15 pts. 12mo.

1852

An analytical catalogue of Mr. Chapman's publications [annotated by 'George Eliot'].

Cheap books and how to get them: being a reprint from the *Westminster Review*, April 1853, of the article "The commerce of literature," together with a brief account of the origin and progress of the recent agitation for free trade in books.

A report of the proceedings of a meeting, consisting chiefly of authors, held May 4th at the house of Mr. John Chapman . . . for the purpose of hastening the removal of the trade restrictions on the commerce of literature.

The bookselling system. The following letter was addressed to the editor of "The Athenaeum," who . . . deferred its publication.

1853-4

(Ed.) Chapman's Quarterly Series. 7 vols. 12 mo.

1856

Medical despotism. In *Westminster Review*, April 1856, 65.

1858

Medical reform. In *Westminster Review*, April 1858, 69.

Medical education. In *Westminster Review*, July 1858, 70.

Chloroform and other anaesthetics; how they act, how they kill, and how they may be safely

* Unless otherwise stated the items are all 8vo and have the imprint London, John Chapman.

used. Reprinted (with additions) from *Medical Times and Gazette*, n.s. 17. London, Savill and Edwards.

1859

Chloroform and other anaesthetics: their history and use during childbirth. Reprinted from the *Westminster Review*, 72. London, Williams and Norgate.

1860

Christian revivals: their history and natural history. Reprinted from *Westminster Review*, 73. London, George Manwaring.

1863

A new method of treating disease by controlling the circulation of the blood in different parts of the body. In *Medical Times and Gazette*, July 18, 1863.

Functional diseases of women: cases illustrative of a new method of treating them through the agency of the nervous system by means of cold and heat. Also, an appendix containing cases illustrative of a new method of treating epilepsy, paralysis, and diabetes. London, Trübner and Co.

1864

Functional diseases of the stomach. Pt. 1: Sea-sickness, its nature and treatment. London, Trübner and Co.

1865

Diarrhoea and cholera, their origin, proximate cause, and cure, through the agency of the nervous system, by means of ice. London, Trübner and Co. Also: Philadelphia, Lippincott and Co., 1866.

1866

The same; 2nd. edition, enlarged. London, Trübner and Co.

1868

Sea-sickness, and how to prevent it: an explanation of its nature and successful treatment, through the agency of the nervous system, by means of the spinal ice-bag. With an introduction on the general principles of neuro-therapeutics. 2d edition. London, Trübner and Co.

Dr. Chapman's spine-bags.

1870

The medical institutions of the United Kingdom: a history exemplifying the evils of over-legislation. London, J. Churchill and Sons. Reprinted from *Medical Mirror*, 1869-70.

Prostitution: governmental experiments in controlling it. London, Trübner and Co. Reprint from *Westminster Review*, n.s. nos. 89 and 90.

1871

Cases of diarrhoea and cholera treated successfully through the agency of the nervous sys-

tem, chiefly by means of the spinal ice-bag. London, Baillière, Tindall and Cox.

1873

Neuralgia and kindred diseases of the nervous system: their nature, causes, and treatment. Also, a series of cases, preceded by an analytical exposition of them, exemplifying the principles and practice of neuro-dynamic medicine. London, J. and A. Churchill.

1874

Medical charity: its abuses, and how to remedy them. Reprinted from *Westminster Review*, n.s. nos. 89 and 90.

1878

Du traitement névro-dynamique dans certaines maladies des yeux. Paris, P. Asselin. Reprinted from *Recueil d'Ophthalmologie*, Paris, 1878, 5.

1883

Cholera, a disease of the nervous system. (Also) Reviews of Dr. Chapman's work on diarrhoea and cholera (etc.), 2nd. ed., London, J. and A. Churchill, 1866.

The same (French tr.), Paris, G. Masson; pp. 1-8 reprinted from *Journal de Médecine de Paris*, 1883, 5.

1884

The non-contagiousness, causation, and scientific treatment of cholera. In *Westminster Review*, 1884, pp. 472-533. London, Trübner and Co.

1885

Cholera curable; a demonstration of the causes, non-contagiousness, and successful treatment of the disease. London, J. and A. Churchill.

1889

The treatment of epilepsy; principles and practice. Abstract of a paper read to the Medical Society of London, March 18, 1867, and of the ensuing debate upon it. London, Trübner and Co.

1892

L'origine nerveuse des maladies et de leur traitement efficace par l'action directe sur le système nerveux. Une communication faite à l'Académie de Médecine de Paris le 14 juin 1892. Paris, Asselin and Houzeau.

A summary of an essay on the nervous origin of diseases and their successful treatment by acting directly on the nervous system. London, J. and A. Churchill; Paris, Galignani.



